



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,036	04/06/2000	Catherine Lin-Hendel	101156-5001US	7503
24341	7590	12/10/2009		
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. (PA)			EXAMINER	
2 PALO ALTO SQUARE			TRAN, MYLINH T	
3000 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PALO ALTO, CA 94306			2179	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/544,036	LIN-HENDEL, CATHERINE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MY LINH TRAN	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/03/2009.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 08/20/2009 has been entered and carefully considered. However, the limitations of the amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior arts of record, therefore, claims 1-78 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the office action mailed (01/12/2009).

Information Disclosure Statement

Some of the IDS have been considered but will not be printed; thus have been crossed out.

Claim Objections

Claims 32-47 and 63-65 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 32-47 and 63-65 are drawn to a system, however, they appear to be lacking at least one structural component. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-31, 48-62 and 66-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description

requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation of claims 1, 27 and 48, 57 cited “simultaneously displaying together multiple ones of the retrieved webpages in a single display screen” is not described in the specification. The specification only describes the limitation of simultaneously displaying associated destination objects.

Claims 32-47 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation of claims 32, cited “the plurality of sub-framed array...independently and selectively scrolled without user action other than a user initiating such scrolling..” is not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-24, 26-30, 48, 52-53, 56-61 and 66-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allard et al. [US. 6,249,773] in view of Yonezawa et al. (Patent No. 5905973).

As per independent claims 1, 27, 48, 57, 60 and 76-78, Allard et al. teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for selecting and simultaneously displaying a plurality of digitally stored objects comprising the steps/means:

means for displaying an array of digitally stored objects (see figure 2 and col. 6 lines 56-67, wherein Figure 2 shows a plurality of sale products in a plurality of rows; wherein each row representing a sale product; further note sale products are stored in Inventory Warehouse DB 30 as shown in Fig. 1);

means for displaying digitally stored objects via a webpage (e.g., see Figs. 1, 2 and col. 4, lines 11-27; wherein the plurality of sale products are displayed in a Web browser, i.e., NETSCAPE);

means for selecting on said webpage a plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects (e.g., see Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 58-67; wherein check boxes 70 allow the user to select a plurality of sale products on

the Web browser), each displayed digitally stored object having at least one associated webpage (e.g., see Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 58-67, col. 6 lines 56-67; wherein the check boxes allow the user to dynamically include the selected objects into a shopping list/cart; the object could be considered as the webpage because the webpage could be an empty webpage that could be an object);

Allard et al. teach means for retrieving the at least one associated webpage for each selected one of the plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects together from a storage medium (e.g., see Figs. 2, 5; wherein multiple selected objects (empty webpages) in the list/cart can be retrieved by clicking the function "View Cart Contents" option in a pull-down menu).

While Allard et al. shows a "shopping cart" option that can be selected in a pull-down menu (e.g., see Fig. 5), Allard et al. does not explicitly show what the shopping cart looks like on the screen in response to the selection of this option. Particularly, Allard et al. does not expressly mention that the multiple retrieved objects are simultaneously displayed together multiple ones of the retrieved webpages in a single display screen.

However, simultaneously displaying the plurality of retrieved items (plurality of empty webpages) of the shopping list/cart in a single window for viewing is a well-known feature as demonstrated by

Yonezawa et al. (wherein Fig. 4 shows an example of the shopping cart/basket contents having a plurality of retrieved items (could be considered as empty webpage) of the shopping cart/basket being simultaneously displayed in a single window). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the shopping list builder of Allard et al. to include the well-known feature of simultaneously displayed the retrieved objects of the shopping cart/basket in a single window for viewing to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide the ability for the customer to review the selected objects concurrently before deciding to buy the selected items; thus, to promote a business.

As per claim 2, Allard et al. teach means for providing a two-dimensional array of thumbnails of the digitally stored objects (figure 5, the two- dimensional array of thumbnails 100 including the stored objects 110, 112 and 114).

As per claim 3, Allard et al. teach the thumbnails in the two-dimensional array can be selectively scrolled at any one of the plurality of speeds, and can be selectively stopped from scrolling (figure 5, a scroll bar).

As per claim 4, Allard et al. teach the thumbnails in the two dimensional array can be selectively scrolled vertically (figure 5, the scroll bar).

As per claim 5, Allard et al. teach the scroll bar (figure 5). Allard et al. fail to teach the thumbnails in the two dimensional array can be selectively scrolled horizontally. However, it is well known and would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Allard to include the scroll bar to combine with the well known implementation of scrolling horizontally. The motivation of the combination would have been to display hidden items/objects that are not currently shown.

As per claim 6, Allard et al. fail to clearly teach the two dimensional array of thumbnails having a selectively adjustable number of columns and rows. However, it would have been obvious that a programmer/a software engineer should be able to adjust the number of columns and rows and to change a format of a table display.

As per claim 7, Allard et al. teaches means for sub-framing information associated with the selected plurality of digitally stored objects (figure 2, sub-framing information (70) and sub-framing information (72)).

As per claims 8 and 56, Allard et al. teach the sub-framing means including a horizontal dynamic scroll bar and a vertical dynamic

scroll bar that allow an orderly arrangement and presentation of content extending beyond a viewable area of a sub-frame (figure 2 includes the scroll bar that allow an orderly arrangement and presentation of content extending beyond a viewable area of a sub-frame).

Allard et al. fail to teach the horizontal dynamic scroll bar and a vertical dynamic scroll bar. However, it is well known and would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Allard to include the scroll bar to combine with the well known implementation of scrolling horizontally. The motivation of the combination would have been to display hidden icons that are not shown.

As per claims 9-10, 28 and 61, 70, Allard et al. teach the selection means includes a different check box associated with each one of the plurality of digitally stored objects (figure 2, check boxes (70); the retrieval means includes a submit button or a "go" button (figure 5, selecting "View Cart Content"); each one of the plurality of displayed digitally stored objects adapted to be selected one at a time by using a computer input device to select a different check box such that a check appears in the check box (figure 2, a pick list includes multiple check boxes); and

after a plurality of the digitally stored objects (all the items are selected in box 70) is selected and in response to invoking the button

using the computer input device, retrieve together and simultaneously display together the associated destination objects (figure 5, selecting the "View Cart Content").

As per claim 11, Allard et al. teach single clicking on the selected check box de-selects a link to the associated destination object so that the check box reverts to being unchecked indicating that the associated webpage is un-selected (figure 2).

As per claims 12 and 29, Allard et al. the selection means being adapted to select each selected displayed digitally stored object of the selected plurality of displayed digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of displayed digitally stored objects and (figure 2, the pick list (70), single activation of the input device (figure 2, clicking "ADD TO CART"); and after all of the selected plurality of displayed digitally stored objects have been selected (all of the items in the check list are selected), and in response to double activation the input device button to retrieve together the plurality of digitally stored objects and simultaneously displaying the retrieve web pages (the associated destination objects) (figure 5, select "VIEW CART CONTENTS");

As per claims 13-14, 72, It would have been obvious that Allard et al. teach each one of the different associated link-tokens being a first color and each time one of the plurality of digitally stored objects is

selected by single clicking the computer mouse button, the first color changes to a second color to indicate the selection of the digitally stored object because changing a first color to a second color to indicate the selection of the digitally stored object is very basic of HTML. The color is changed by default. The motivation would have been for the user to recognize the object link being selected.

As per claim 15, Allard et al. teach single clicking on the selected link-token de-selecting the link-token so that the link-token reverts to the first color indicating the de-selection of the link-token (figure 2).

As per claims 16, Allard et al. teach means for selecting the plurality of digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to and clicking on a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects (figure 2, column 5, line 56 through column 6, line 20).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 13; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 18, Allard et al. teach the selection means being employed and the retrieval means being invoked using a computer mouse having a first button and a second button (figure 5, “ADD TO CART” button and “VIEW CART CONTENT” button), the plurality of

digitally stored objects being selected one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and clicking the first (figure 2), and then after all of the plurality of digitally stored objects have been selected (the first button “ADD TO CART” is selected, all of the objects are selected and stored in the shopping cart, clicking the second computer mouse button to retrieve and simultaneously display the associated destination objects (the second button “VIEW CART CONTENT” is selected, all the retrieved objects simultaneously displayed).

As per claims 19 and 20, which are both dependent on claim 18, it would have been obvious that Allard et al. teach the first one of the retrieved associated destination objects simultaneously displayed for viewing being made larger than the other simultaneously displayed destination objects by using a computer input device to invoke the first destination object, and when the computer input device being used to invoke a second one of the retrieved associated destination objects simultaneously displayed for viewing, the first destination object returns to the same smaller size of the other simultaneously displayed destination objects and the second destination object is made larger than the other simultaneously displayed destination objects because Allard teaches an hyper text markup language HTML page. Making

larger an object image by using a computer input device is very basic of HTML. in order to provide better view for the users.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 18, it is a similar scope to claims 13 and 14, therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale and further teaches wherein the third color indicates that the digitally stored object in the list have been previously selected and that the retrieved webpages have been previously displayed. It would have been obvious that said objects and webpages have been previously selected indicate the different color. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the shopping list builder of Allard et al. to include the well-known feature of the third color indicates that the digitally stored objects and webpages have been previously selected to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide the ability for the customer to recognize the previously selected objects/webpages.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 1, Allard teaches the system being used on a personal computer (column 4, lines 10-25).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Allard teaches the system being used with a computer network (column 4, lines 10-25).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 1, Allard teaches the system being used on a CD ROM (column 4, lines 10-25).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent that system would be implemented using software.

As per claim 30, Allard et al. teach selecting each one of the plurality of digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and after a plurality of the digitally stored objects have been selected. It would have been obvious that Allard et al. teach clicking the first computer mouse button while holding down the second computer mouse button and clicking the first computer mouse button without holding the second computer mouse button in order to control the selection of these objects.

As per claims 52 and 53, Allard teaches the sub-frame in the two-dimensional array can be selectively scrolled vertical (scroll bar, figure 5). Allard et al. fail to teach the thumbnails in the two dimensional array can be selectively scrolled horizontally. However, it is well known and would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Allard to include the scroll bar to combine with the well known implementation of scrolling horizontally. The motivation of the combination would have been to display hidden items/objects that are not currently shown.

As per claim 58, it would have been obvious that the plurality of web pages being from a plurality of web sites.

As per claim 59, Allard teaches the single display screen presenting the information in an array (figure 2).

As per claims 66-69, Allard et al. teach each webpage being displayed without a header and a tab (figure 2).

As per claim 71, Allard et al. teach selecting each one of the plurality of digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and after a plurality of the digitally stored objects have been selected. It would have been obvious that Allard et al. teach clicking the first computer mouse button while holding down the second computer mouse button and clicking the first computer mouse button without holding the second computer mouse button in order to control the selection of these objects. Allard et al. teach the selection means being employed and the retrieval means being invoked using a computer mouse having a first button and a second button (figure 5, "ADD TO CART" button and "VIEW CART CONTENT" button), the plurality of digitally stored objects being selected one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and clicking the first (figure 2), and then after all of the plurality of digitally stored objects have been

selected (the first button “ADD TO CART” is selected, all of the objects are selected and stored in the shopping cart, clicking the second computer mouse button to retrieve and simultaneously display the associated destination objects (the second button “VIEW CART CONTENT” is selected, all the retrieved objects simultaneously displayed).

As per claims 73-75, simultaneously displaying the plurality of retrieved items (plurality of empty webpages) of the shopping list/cart in a single window for viewing is a well-known feature as demonstrated by Yonezawa et al. (wherein Fig. 4 shows an example of the shopping cart/basket contents having a plurality of retrieved items (could be considered as empty webpage) of the shopping cart/basket being simultaneously displayed in a single window). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the shopping list builder of Allard et al. to include the well-known feature of simultaneously displayed the retrieved objects of the shopping cart/basket in a single window for viewing to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide the ability for the customer to review the selected objects concurrently before deciding to buy the selected items; thus, to promote a business.

2. Claim 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allard et al. [US. 6,249,773] in view of Yonezawa et al (Patent No. 5905973) and further in view of Szabo (Patent No. 5954640).

As per claim 25, Allard et al. and Yonezawa et al. teach the limitation of claim 1 for the same reasons as set forth in the foregoing rejection of claim 1. Allard et al. and Yonezawa et al. do not teach the feature of the system being used on a wireless device. However, Szabo teach the wireless device such as hand held device, PDA in the on-line shopping which is the same field with the Allard's system (e.g., see Szabo col. 4 lines 12-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the shopping list builder of Allard et al. and Yonezawa et al. to include the wireless device of Szabo. The motivation of the combination would have been easy for the users to carry it; and access to the system everywhere.

3. Claims 31-47 and 49-51, 54-55, 62-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daughtrey [US. 7,409,643] in view of Allard et al. [US. 6,249,773].

4. **As per independent claims 31-32, 49, 62 and 64,** Daughtrey teach a single webpage including a plurality of sub-framed arrays (figure 3, sub-framed array “multiple airlines”, sub-framed array “Delta Airlines”, sub-framed array “American Airlines”), each of the sub-framed arrays including a frame with a plurality of thumbnails (sub-framed array “multiple airlines” including a plurality of thumbnails and a plurality of independently selectable sub-frames of (“Multiple airlines”, “From \$376”, “From \$604”). Daughtrey fail to clearly teach the step of scrolling without user action other than a user initiating such scrolling of a respective one of the plurality of sub-framed arrays; and scrolling without user action, to be independently stoppable by the user. However, Allard et al. teach a two-dimentional (figure 2, 70) including a vertical dynamic scroll bar that allow an orderly arrangement and presentation of content extending beyond a viewable area (figure 2 includes the scroll bar that allow an orderly arrangement and presentation of content extending beyond a viewable area of a sub-frame). Allard teaches the sub-framed array being configured to be independently and selectively scrolled without user action other than a user initiating such scrolling of a respective one of the plurality of sub-framed arrays and the sub-framed array being configured, when scrolling without user action, to be independently stoppable by the user (the user selects the scroll bar of figure 2 is considered as the user’s

initiating action; the sub-frame can be stopped scrolling by the user's initiating action of stop selecting the scroll bar).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the scrolling of the sub-framed array of Allard et al. to include the plurality of sub-framed arrays including a plurality of thumbnails of Daughtrey to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to display hidden icons that are not shown.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 32, Daughtrey disclose when a page loads for a first time a default category selected by a website operator is displayed, and when the page loads for a time other than the first time, a category corresponding to the category last viewed by the viewer when they accessed the page is displayed. It is inherent in Daughtrey's web-based system that when a multi-frame web page is loaded for the first time, the default category frame is loaded and when the page is loaded for a time other than the first time, by hitting the back button, a category corresponding to the category last viewed by the viewer when they accessed the page is displayed.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 32, Daughtrey fails to teach the scroll bar. Allard teach the scroll bar indicate how much of the objects has been viewed and also indicating the beginning and end of the sub-frame array (figure 2).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the scrolling of Allard et al. to include the plurality of sub-framed arrays to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide the ability for the customer to recognize how much they have been reviewed the objects before deciding to buy the selected items; thus, to promote a business.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 32, Daughtrey in view of Allard disclose when a viewer moves a cursor to a thumbnail of interest, the sub-frame array stops rolling. It would have been well known in the art that the high level information regarding the thumbnail appears in a dialog box positioned approximate to the thumbnail of interest is taught in an hyper text markup language HTML page. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the teaching of the combination of Allard et al. and Allard to include the well-known feature of the high level information regarding the thumbnail appearing in a dialog box positioned approximate to the thumbnail of interest to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide the ability for the customer to obtain a brief information about the thumbnail quickly.

As per claim 36, Daughtrey teaches selecting a thumbnail of interest results in a larger image of the thumbnail appearing with more detailed information in a sub-frame that the viewer can scroll manually or that can be automatically scrolled (Figure 3).

As per claims 37 and 38, which are dependent on claim 32 and 37 respectively, it would have been obvious that Daughtrey teach when a viewer selects a thumbnail of interest, a border surrounding the thumbnail being highlighted wherein a color of the highlighted border changes to indicate that the image has been selected and viewed because changing a first color to a second color to indicate the selection of the thumbnail is very basic of HTML. The color is changed by default. The motivation would have been for the user to recognize the thumbnails being selected.

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 38, it is inherent that Daughtrey teaches after viewing the thumbnail the viewer being not interested in the selected thumbnail, the viewer can close the image (the user selects the killing box) and the color of the highlighted border changes or disappears to indicate that the thumbnail was viewed but of no further interest to the viewer. It would have been obvious that Daughtrey teach when a viewer selects a thumbnail of interest, a border surrounding the thumbnail being highlighted wherein a color of the

highlighted border changes to indicate that the image has been selected and viewed because changing a first color to a second color to indicate the selection of the thumbnail is very basic of HTML. The color is changed by default. The motivation would have been for the user to recognize the thumbnails being selected.

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 32, Allard disclose when a viewer removes a cursor from a thumbnail; the sub-frame array in which the thumbnail resides resumes scrolling (figure 2).

As per claims 41 and 42, which are all dependent on claim 32, it is inherent in Daughtrey's window system that the position of the thumbnail relative to the sub-frame array is selectively controllable by the viewer or a website operator;

Daughtrey teaches the enlarged and more detailed image of the thumbnail can, in response to user action, remain on-screen, be minimized or pushed to the background (the user's action on the thumbnail "From \$376").

As per claim 43, Daughtrey teaches displaying any desired number of sub-frame arrays of interest (figure 3). Daughtrey fails to teach the sub-frame array extended beyond the screen being able to be manually scrolled horizontally and vertically into view. However, Allard et al. teach the thumbnails in the two dimensional array can be selectively scrolled vertically (figure 5, the scroll bar). It is well known

and would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Allard to include the scroll bar to combine with the well known implementation of scrolling horizontally. The motivation of the combination would have been to display hidden items.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Allard to include the scroll bar in the sub-framed array to combine with the plurality sub-framed arrays of Daughtrey in order to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation of the combination would have been to display plurality of items/objects for the user to purchase; thus promote the business.

As per claim 44, which is dependent on claim 32, Daughtrey teaches the sub-frame arrays that have selected can be enlarged and can include transactional commands to process a commercial transaction. The thumbnail of "Multiple airlines" can be selected to enlarge and can include transactional commands to process a commercial transaction (figure 3).

As per claim 45, Daughtrey teaches the thumbnails displaying advertising (figure 3).

As per claim 46, which is dependent on claim 32, Daughtrey discloses each sub-framed array including at least one textual link or at least one graphical link, each link representing a different category of

information (Figure 3). The system further comprising: A first category menu (figure 3, 74a) configured to be displayed when the user moves a cursor over a respective link, wherein the first category menu has at least one sub-category that is associated with the category of information of the respective; and a second category menu (figure 3, 74b) displayed concurrently with the first category menu when the user moves the cursor over a sub-category of the first category menu.

As per claim 47, which is dependent on claim 46, Daughtrey teaches a plurality of thumbnails associated with the selected category in the sub-framed array configured to be displayed in response to selection of a sub-category (figure 3, the “Airlines” tab is selected).

As per claims 50 and 55, Daughtrey teaches displaying a two-dimensional array of sub-frames of the digitally stored objects.

As per claim 51, while Daughtrey teaches the multiple sub-frames in the two-dimensional array, Allard teaches the scroll bar that can be selectively scrolled at any one of a plurality of speeds and can be selectively stopped from scrolling. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the scrolling of the sub-framed array of Allard et al. to include the plurality of sub-framed arrays including a plurality of thumbnails to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated

to make such a combination is to display hidden icons that are not shown.

As per claim 54, Daughtrey in view of Allard teaches plurality of sub-frames with a scroll bar. Allard et al. fail to clearly teach the two dimensional array of thumbnails having a selectively adjustable number of columns and rows. However, it would have been obvious that a programmer/a software engineer should be able to adjust the number of columns and rows and to change a format of a table display.

As to claim 63, Daughtrey teaches the user being a viewer of the single display screen or a website operator of the single display screen (figure 3).

As to claim 65, Daughtrey fails to teach a scroll bar with an icon. However, Allard teaches a speed control icon on the single web page that can be employed by a user to control scrolling speed of a respective sub-framed array (the user can selects the arrow icon in the scroll bar and control the speed of scrolling by selecting the arrow faster or slower);

A stop icon on the single web page that can be employed by the user to stop scrolling of a respective sub-framed array that is scrolling without user action (the user can stop scrolling by not selecting the scroll bar); and a go icon on the single web page that can be employed

by the user to initiate scrolling without user action of a respective sub-framed array (the user selects the arrow icon to initiate scrolling).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the scrolling of the sub-framed array of Allard et al. to include the plurality of sub-framed arrays including a plurality of thumbnails to achieve the claimed invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide a ability for the user to review the object items.

Response to Arguments

Regarding to Applicant's argument filed 08/20/2009 and 10/19/2009

Applicant has argued that the combination of Allard and Yonezawa fail to clearly teach the limitation of "simultaneously displaying together each one of the retrieved web pages in a single window". However, while Allard teaches selecting on said webpage a plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects (e.g., see Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 58-67; wherein check boxes 70 allow the user to select a plurality of sale products on the Web browser), each displayed digitally stored object having at least one associated webpage (e.g., see Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 58-67, col. 6 lines 56-67; wherein the check boxes allow the user to dynamically include the selected objects into a shopping list/cart.) **In this case**, the object could be considered as the

webpage because the webpage could be an empty webpage that could be an object); Allard et al. teach multiple selected objects (empty web pages) in the list/cart can be retrieved by clicking the function "View Cart Contents" option in a pull-down menu), Yonezawa et al. teach simultaneously displaying the plurality of retrieved items (plurality of empty webpages) of the shopping list/cart in a single window for viewing is a well-known feature as demonstrated by Yonezawa et al. (wherein Fig. 4 shows an example of the shopping cart/basket contents having a plurality of retrieved items (could be considered as empty webpage) of the shopping cart/basket being simultaneously displayed in a single window).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 32-34 and 40-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end

of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

/Steven B Theriault/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179